[Shri T. R. Balu]

I would also request the hon. Minister to kindly introduce, and provide medical units in the G. T. Express Tamil Nadu Express and other super fast trains from Tamil Nadu for the benefit of passengers.

While concluding, I would like to point out that the Railway Ministry is rather using the department as a main weapon to introduce Hindi in Tamil Nadu and we strongly condemn this imperialistic attitude of the Government. I would like to caution that we will never allow Hindi in any manner or in any form, to enter into Tamil Nadu. Here, I would like to point out that when we entrain, we find that only Hindi words are used as instructions to the passengers. I request the Railway Minister to kindly introduce regional languages in the bogies and with that I conclude.

Thank you.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE—*Contd.*

Notification of the Ministry of Finance (Department of Revenue) and Related Paper

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI M. M. JACOB): Sir on behalf of Shri B. K. Gadhvi, I beg to lay on the Table a copy (in English and Hindi) of the Ministry of Finance (Department of Revenue) Notification No. 453/86- Central Excises, dated the 20th November, 1986, amending Notification No. 223/86-Central Excises, dated the 3rd April, 1986, to restrict the excise duty exemption available to woven sacks of polymers of ethylen or propylene or a combination thereof only if such sacks are manufactured on flat knitting looms, together with an Explanatory Memorandum thereon.

STATEMENT BY MINISTER—RE: **objectionable Maps Distributed by the Pakistani Pavilion at India International Trade Fair 1986.** . .. .

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH): Sir, Hon'ble Members are aware that the Pakistani pavilion at the 7th India International Trade Fair distributed a tourist guide and a brochure entitled "Pakistans Northern Areas" containing Maps which showed Jammu and Kashmir in an unacceptable manner.

As soon as this came to the notice of Government, the Minister in the Pakistan Embassy was summoned to the Ministry of External Affairs on 19 November, 1986 and a protest lodged. It was pointed out that the distribution of such objectionable material violated Indian law and was in contravention of accepted diplomatic practice. In conveying Government's displeasure over this incident, it was made clear to the Pakistani official that the objectionable material be immediately withdrawn.

The Ministry of External Affairs was assured that the maps had been withdrawn.

Instructions have also been issued to the concerned authorities to ensure that, if any effort is made again to distribute such material, action under the relevant provisions of the law is instituted.

SHRI MOSTAFA BIN QUASEM (West Bengal): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, it is a very serious matter involving a very important aspect of our national interest and I think it should be viewed in its right perspective by the Government of India. Sir, the map was contained not in a booklet published by some private agency or private publishing house in Pakistan, it was contained in the official tourist guide of the Government of Pakistan. I do not believe that it is an act of mistake on their part. It is a deliberate cartographical impertinance committed by the Pakistani authorities. It should be viewed like that. My information goes and it appeared in the press that this map, this objectionable map, came out in the tourist guide published in the 1985 edition of the tourist guide published by the Pakistan Tourism Development Corporation. May I know from the Minister

whether it came to the notice of the Government of India only when these tourist guides were distributed in the International Trade Fair currently being held? Did it not come to the notice of the Indian diplomatic mission in Pakistan before? If not, would the Minister kindly agree with me in saying that this is another example of bismal performance by our diplomatic missions abroad.

Secondly, Sir, I came to know from the statement that some routine protest has been lodged with the Pakistan authorities. May I know, considering the gravity of the matter, whether the hon. Minister has taken advantage of the recently concluded SAARC meeting at Bangalore to take up this matter with the Pakistani authorities at any level when Pakistani authorities at any level when the Conference?

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA (Andhra Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I do not know in what terms I should find fault with the Government of India for its callous attitude. Month after month we hear such news. Hardly two or three months back, there was the socalled Azad Kashmir representative at Harare and when we showed our dismay, it was found that the invitation was extended by India.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: No. it was not.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: At least that was what was reported here in the newspapers. You please tell when you want to tell.

Then, Sir, a rumour floats in Pakistan. And it was there for the whole day, regarding possible attack on the Prime Minister and other high dignitaries of the country. We still get the information after the event--that too 12 hours after the event.

Now comes the third incident: a map showing Jammu and Kashmir as a disputed area is shown and distributed on Indian soil.

I think there cannot be anything more shameful than this. Somebody sneaks into Harare, in the NAM Conference, where India was the Chairman before she handed over this chairmanship. The Pakistan stall could have the temerity to publish and distribute a map showing a legitimate part of India as disputed area. What is the effect, Sir? We have protested. That is all. We have done nothing more than that. Is a mere protest sufficient in these circumstances when incident after incident is being created by Pakistan and they are gaining advantage with what we have been holding in this country. It appears that the offensive which Pakistan has been launching in India has been successful throughout. On the contrary India's effort has been only a defensive action or a very mild protest. I do not know what is the situation.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL): Please seek clarifications.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: Therefore, in view of this, I would like to ask: does the Government of India feel that it is just sufficient to lodge a protest with the Pakistan Government? Or will the Government take further steps so that the country will have the confidence that this Government will not allow such things by which the fair name of India is under impairment?

Secondly, the fourth paragraph is very interesting. 'Instructions have also been issued to the concerned authorities to ensure that if any effort is made again to distribute such material, action under the relevant provision of the law is instituted." Does it mean that the remainder of the material which was distributed is still on the Indian soil in the Pakistani stall? What efforts have been made by Government of India to see that such material has been siezed and confiscated? If anybody were to possess such material, he or she or the group would have been put to lots of problems. But here is a Government organisation, staying on the soil of India and still having the possibility of such material being possessed and, as is indicated by paragraph four, it could perhaps be distributed in future. I think there cannot be a more dismal performance than this on the part of the External

[Prof. C. Lakshmanna]

Affairs Ministry and the other Ministries of Government of India.

Therefore, I would like to ask the Minister if he has taken all the steps possible to see that no such materials exists, either in the Embassy or in the stall, which is on the soil of India, and whether the Minister is in a position to assure us in this House and the country as a whole that there would be no such recurrence; therefore, this fourth paragraph is redundant in view of the precautions taken. I would like to seek these clarifications from the Minister.

6 P.M.

SHRI GHULAM RASOOL MATTO (Jammu and Kashmir): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the statement given by the Minister is perhaps short of what has appeared in the newspapers. It says "....Maps which showed Jammu and Kashmir in an unacceptable manner," whereas in the newspapers it has been categorically stated that Jammu and Kashmir was shown as a disputed territory. But here it is written, "...in an unacceptable manner," This needs to be elaborated. Why I ask this is because, in the so-called Azad Kashmir they are showing northern areas which are under their occupation, namely, Gilgit and Skardu, as northern parts of Pakistan. So, I would like to know whether in this tourist map only that part which is under their occupation is shown or it is the entire area, because this "unacceptable manner" is not clear to me. This may kindly be clarified. My second point for clarification is what Mr. Quasem has said, that the map has been printed in 1985. If this is so, please confirm whether it is so. After all, tourist material is easily and readily available anywhere and everywhere. Has our embassy at Rawalpindi or our Consulate-General at Karachi had any access to such material and pointed it out to our authorities here in India? My third point is, it has been stated in a very diplomatic manner—Mr. Natwar Singh is a diplomat and he has, I think, used the diplomatic language— that "The Ministry of External Affairs was assured that the maps had been withdrawn." When the Minister of the Pakistan Embassy was called to the External Affairs Ministry, he was only told that such thing had happened, but when was it said that he assured that the maps were withdrawn? Why should you use the word "assured?" Why should not you categorically state that the maps have been wihtdrawn? Lastly, Sir, in paragraph 4 it is stated that "action under the relevant provisions of the law" will be instituted. What action does the Government of India propose to institute in case of default by the Pakistan Government?

श्री अश्विनी कुमार (बिहार) : माननीय उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आपके माध्यम से दो-तीन बातों की ओर ध्यान आकर्षित करके विदेश मंत्री महोदय का स्पष्टोकरण चाहूंगा । कई बार, इधर पिछले साल-दो साल में ऐसी अनेकानेक घटनाएं हो गयी हैं कि पाकिस्तान और चीन ने इस प्रकार के बहुत से नक्शे प्रकाशित किए हैं, जिसमें बहुत से भारतीय भू भाग को उन्होंने अपने नक्शे में अपनी सीमा में या उसे झगड़े की जगह, ऐसा करके दिखाया गया है। मैं जानना चाहूंगा कि इसके बारे में क्या सरकार कोई एक स्पष्ट नीति ले रही है कि किस प्रकार चीन और पाकिस्तान से नक्शों के बारे में बात करें? अभी आज का जो यह नक्शा है, पाकिस्तान टूरिस्ट ने मेप किया, हमारे मित्र ने बताया कि यह सन 1985 में छपा था, आज हमारे अफसरने कह दिया कि यहां विद-ड्रा हो गया है । परन्तु सारे दुनियां के देशों में, जहां-जहां पाकिस्तान अपने बाहर से टूरिस्ट बुलाना चाहता है, यह फैलाया जायेगा। सारी दुनियां में, अमरीका में, इंगलैण्ड में, रूस में, सारी दुनियां में फैलाया जायगा इसको । रोकने के लिए क्या सरकार कोई कदम सोच रही है ? तीसरा प्रश्न, मैं पूछना चाहूंगा, यह केवल पाकिस्तान या चीन का नहीं है, अभी एशियन गेम के अन्दर नक्शा प्रकाशित किया गया, उसमें भी भारत की सीमाएं ठीक से प्रकाशित नहीं की गयीं थीं और जैसा हमने अखबारों में पढ़ा, हमारी मंत्री महोदया वहां गयी

थी माग्रेट आल्वा जी, उन्होंने वहां पर उसके विरोध पत्र भी दिया, लेकिन उस विरोध पत्र के ऊपर कुछ नहीं हुआ क्योंकि पाकिस्तान ने कहा कि अगर इसमें सुधार किया या तो वे वाक-आउट कर देंगे। मैं पूछना चाहता हूं, यह जो रोज-रोज इस प्रकार हमारी सीमा के ऊपर नक्शों के माध्यम से आक्रमण हो रहे ,है सिग्रोल, साऊथ कोरिया ने भी किया, इनके बारे में कोई समग्र नीति बनाकर विदेश मंत्रालय काम करने जा रहा है क्या ?

SHRI J. P. GOYAL (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, my friend, Mr. Ashwani Kumar has rightly said that this thing has been going on. I would request the hon. Minister to categorically state to the entire world that Jammu and Kashmir—of course, we have been saying so—is an undisputed territory of India, that it is a part of India and that nobody can challenge it. We should assert, in fact, just as they are asserting. They are everytime invading the Jammu and Kashmir area. Why should we not say emphatically that the so-called 'Azad Kashmir' area is a part of our country, on which they have encroached? We should make all efforts to get it liberated.

My friend, Mr. Matto has rightly asked some questions to the Minister. I also want to ask questions. I would request the hon. Minister to tell us whether in the recent SAARC meeting there was a bilateral dialogue—of course, the Prime Minister said that some other statement will come—regarding this very map, whether there was any talk between our Prime Minister and the Prime Minister of Pakistan.

The other thing which I want to point out is this. Suppose tomorrow again the same thing will happen. China is also doing, Pakistan is also doing. They are two friends who have arrayed against us, and they are making all efforts to create inconveniance to us. Suppose tomorrow the same thing happens. You have said, "We have asked the authorities concerned to take action under the relevant provisions of law." What action do you propose to take? I want clarifications on these points.

SHRI VISHVJIT PRITHVIJIT SINGH (Maharashtra): Mr. Vice-Chairman, I want to make a slightly different point from those made by other Members. The basic point is, though participation in the international trade fair is a kind of a semi-diplomatic exercise, it is also a commercial exercise, a publicity exercise, it is more a public relations kind of exercise. We have taken part in international trade fairs all over the world. But never ever have we been under the impression that any of our pavilion is an extension of our embassy or diplomatically hallowed ground. Therefore, I fail to understand. At the Pakistani Pavilion in this International Trade Fair, I know for a fact that our intelligence agencies are present, and we have our security forces present there, especially when we know that this pavilion is of a sensitive nature. As always have our security forces present there.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL): Please ask for clarifications.

SHRI VISHVJIT PRITHVIJIT SINGH: One minute. The point is: in the light of that, did our people who are in charge of security understand that this was happening? If they knew, this was happening, what kind of diplomatic immunity did that pavilion enjoy when the Minister says:

> "It was pointed out that the distribution of such objectionable material violated Indian law and was in contravention of accepted diplomatic practice."

I do not understand from where diplomatic practice comes into this picture. I would, therefore, request the hon. Minister to clarify and tell me why no action was taken when it could very well have been taken under the law and why we are taking shelter under the guise of diplomacy.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHR PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL): Shri Gurudas Das Gupta. Confine yourself to askin for clarifications please.

SHR GURUDAS DAS GUPTA (We Bengal): Sir, in my opinion, the stat ment of the Minister is too softly worde It does not categorically state that b

(Shri Guman Das Gupta)

distributing such a map, Pakistan has committed an act of hostility, and it is an act of unfriendliness. This sort of firmness should have been there at least in the statement because Pakistan had deliberately done it on the soil of India just to encourage the forces of cessession inside the country and anti-integration forces in Kashmir. Therefore, the Government of India should have been bold enough to see the reason in it, the motive behind it and condemned it in a more strong language. That is a failing here, and this is unfortunate.

Secondly, I understand, Mr. Chairperson, Sir, this is a government which at the behest of the imperialist powers had been doing all mischief that is possible to destabilise the region, to destabilise the country, to destablise the secular forces. All that is being done by that country by acquiring sophisticated materials, and all that. Therefore, their motive is clear, but Mr. Natwar Singh being a diplomat himself, has couched his statement in a most diplomatic language. I think the diplomacy being pursued by the military rulers of Pakistan should have been met with in a much stronger term. It is nit only a question of sentiments, but it also deserves a stronger condemnation and stronger action. It should meet the brinkmanship of the Pakistani rulers not only with greater wisdom, but also with greater firmness. The Indian Government has been lacking in it for a very long period of time and that is a case where the Government of India lacks in firmness. The imperialist agents must be condemned in a far greater condemnable language, but this is not forthcoming. If you don't do it, then you not only do not serve the national interest, but also do not curb the anti-national forces. I hope the Minister concerned will understand this. This is the demand of the situation.

SRHI P. N. SUKUL (Uttar Pradesh): It is obvious that a tourist Guide and a Brochure entitled 'Pakistan's Northern Areas' containing maps showing Jammu and Kashmir as a part of Pakistan were distributed. It is a definite mischief. There is no doubt about it. It is a mischievous attempt on the part of the Pakistan Government. Moreover, they must be doing it not only in India, but elsewhere also. Wherever such trade fairs are arranged, they must be distributing such Brochures. So, we have to be alert not only in India, but in other countries also where such trade fairs are held and where there is a possibility that Pakistan may commit the saeme sort of mischief. So, action has to be taken there too. Therefore, I would like to know what action is proposed to be taken.

It is said by the Minister that the maps were withdrawn. The point is whether that tourist Guide and the Brochure also was withdrawn or they were not withdrawn. Moreover, whether there was any reference to the territory in it or not. That is also to be studied.

Lastly, I would like to know, as Mr. Vishvajit Prithvijit Singh has also pointed out, what action you can take, as you have stated' action to be taken under relevant provisions of the law'. You have foiled to take action under relevant provisions of the law as just stated by my friend Shri Prithvijit Singh. And since it is another country,—if you refer to diplomatic channels, then, of course, I do not think you are in a position to take any action except registering protest—but mere registering a protest is not going to serve the purpose. It is not going to undo their mischief. So, you have to have your own publicity wing very active almost in all the countries to nullify their campaign. So, I would like to know what action is proposed to be taken in such matters and what action can be taken.

SHRI PUTTAPAGA RADHAKRISHNA (Andhra Pradesh): Some time ago, these Chinese also had shown map in an objectionable manner. At some other time Bangladesh people also published map in an objectionable manner. Now Pakistan's turn has come. Every time our Government is waking up and loading their objection, but afterwards no follow up action has been taken. Now, I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether the Government has alerted the diplomats of our country located in all the neighbouring countries to ascertain as to

whether the neighbouring countries are correctly showing our territories or not. That is my first clarification.

My second clarification is whether Pakistan has published this map for the purpose of tourists. It is also to be ascertained whether it is limited to the tourist map or they are publishing it like that in other publications. Are they publishing in the text-books or in other publications also? Moreover, the same map may be copied by all the friendly countries of Pakistan who are hostile to India. That is why I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether the Government has directed our diplomats in other countries friendly with Pakistan and hostile to us to find out if they have copied the same objectionable map.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: I have listened with some amazement to some of the remarks made by some hon. Members. Now, the Government are second to none in condemning actions of this kind by Pakistan. Sir, having been Ambassador to Pakistan myself, I think, I am in a fairly good position to speak on this matter. I would like to tell the learned Professor that the invitations to the Harare summit were sent by the Government of Zimbabwe and not by the Government of India. At least give us that much credit. You stand up here and make an announcement that India has invited. I want to know where did you get this information from?

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: If it was Zimbabwe, did you protest to that country?

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: Of course, we did.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: What was the reaction of the Zimbabwe which is a friendly country?

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: That is for you to ask the Zimbabwe Government. But we made our protest to both Pakistan and Zimbabwe at the highest level ... *(Interruptions)* ...

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: My question is: what was the reaction of Zimbabwe Government?

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: The Zimbabwe Government listened to our protest and said that we did not know about this and it will not happen in future.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: But it happened.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: So what do you think we should do?

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: You should have protested in much stronger terms.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: How do you protest in stronger terms? Can you define it?

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: That is for you.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: That is what I am trying to tell you.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: You give me that opportunity with the authority, I will show what has to be done.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: I see.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: Well, you are in authority and it is your duty to show that firmness and if you don't show that firmness the nation will not tolerate.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: When your party gets the majority in this Parliament then you can do this. But as long as we are here we are dealing with it.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, is this the way the hon. Minister should speak? He should reply to the questions being put forward by the Members. On a highly sensitive question, he is in a totally aggressive mood. We are here to seek clarifications. We are here to listen to some answers. Of course, this debate will go on. But that is not the way of replying. He is not facing the Opposition on the other side ... *(Interruptions)* ...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL): Please sit down Nothing will go on record ... *(Interruptions)* ...

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: I am not yielding.

Sir, I would like to assure the hon. Members that if there is any doubt in

(Shri K. Natwar Singh)

this, it is a very sad matter. Jammu and Kashmir is an integral part of India Sir, that we should be debating this from that side is extraordinary. We have no doubt that Jammu and Kashmir is a part of India and it will remain a part of India... (*Interruptions*) ...

Sir, in 1980 President Zia-ul-Haq gave a book to Shrimati Indira Gandhi at a meeting, when I was present, in Salisbury which is now called Harare. That book was accepted and after we came back here we have discovered that there was a map inside it and there the borders of Jammu and Kashmir were shown as a disputed territory. The book was returned to President Zia. So Jammu and Kashmir is a part of India.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: You are no more a diplomat. Now you are a Minister.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: These are complicated matters. Diplomatic dealings are carried on at different levels and in different ways. You have to measure your response. Do you think that we are not aware where the boundaries of India are? You say what our diplomats have done in Pakistan. Well, in every single map of Pakistan, Kashmir is shown as part of Pakistan—what do you think the Indian Embassy can do there?

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: At least you can inform them...

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: But do you think that they were not informed.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: It seems like that.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: Well I must say that you are ill-informed. I am putting it most politely. If you think that the Ministry of External Affairs... (*Interruptions*) ...

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: Events do not show that...

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: There is a country which has been saying for the last 40 years something which we don't accept. We want to go on this issue. The issue has been debated day in and day out in the United Nations. The moment it was discovered that the map has been brought here we have taken up the issue with that country. I entirely agree with the hon. Members that this kind of thing is just not done. They should know that they were coming here for the purpose of further enhancing our relations with them. Now, if this is the objective—and they proclaim that this is the objective; this is what their Prime Minister said to our Prime Minister in Bangalore—then surely this is not the kind of thing that that country should do, that they come here for a trade fair, which has no political overtones, and they produce this map in a brochure which causes us deep offence, which questions the territorial integrity of this country. This is not the way to promote good neighbourly relations. So what we did was, we called the man in charge there and told him, "you please have it removed. This is very poor show on your part. This is not done." So, immediately action has been taken. And the latest information is that these brochures and pamphlets are not on display They are not there. They have been taken away. Now, there may be another trade fair in another part of the world and they will do a similar thing there. We will again have to go and protest to the country which is doing this.

Mr. Vishvjit Singh asked how diplomacy is involved in this. Diplomacy comes into this because it is an established diplomatic practice that missions are prohibited from distributing material in a third country which is offensive to the host country. This is a practice which is established everywhere. And this is the practice that they have violated. Now they knew Indian feelings on this. There is no division in the country about this matter at all, regardless of anybody's political persuasions. And yet they have done it. This is not accidental. This is a deliberate effort. A thing like this comes in the way of our having good neighbourly relations, which we want to have with them. We have said so day in and day out. So when they come and do a thing like this, one can only say that deep down they are not interested. If they were interested, they won't do a thing like this. Now this kind of thing is happening. You referred to South Korea. What

was the necessity of doing this? It was a sporting event. The Simla Agreement lays down very clearly the parameters in which our bilateral relations are to be conducted. I myself had a number of discussions with President Zia. I said to him, "You want good relations with India, but you are all the time internationalising the Kashmir question. This is contrary to the spirit of the Simla Agreement." So he said to me, "It is not written anywhere in the Simla Agreement that Zia-ul-Haq should not mention Kashmir." So, I said, "With due respect, will you show me where it is written in the Simla Agreement that Zia-ul-Haq can mention Kashmir?" It is not mentioned anywhere. So the letter and spirit is being flouted. This is our appeal to them: if you want good relations, friendly relations, which we want, please refrain from activities of this kind. And this has been brought to their notice here in Delhi, Islamabad, the world over. Recently in the United Nations, they again raised the Kashmir question. They raised it at Harare. We have told them, "Don't do it. It does not help." But you can take the horse to water; you cannot make it drink.

ANNOUNCEMENT RE. ALLOCATION OF TIME FOR DISPOSAL OF GOVERNMENT AND OTHER BUSINESS

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI PAWAN KUMAN BANSAL): I have to inform Members that the Business Advisory Committee at its meeting held today, the 20th November, 1986, allotted time for Government legislative and other business as follows:

Business	Time allotted
1. Government Motion regarding economic situation in the country.	Discussion on 25th November, 1986 without lunch break and Minister to reply on 26th November, 1986.
2. Consideration and passing of the following Bills, as passed by the Lok Sabha:—	
(a) The Indian Post Office (Amendment) Bill, 1986	3 hours.
(b) The Atomic Energy (Amendment) Bill, 1986.	2 hours.
(c) The Coal Mines Nationalisation Laws (Amendment) Bill, 1986, together with the consideration of a Resolution seeking disapproval of the Coal Mines Nationalisation Laws (Amendment) Ordinance, 1986.	2 hours.
(d) The Customs and Excise Revenue Appellate Tribunal Bill, 1986	

Now, the House is adjourned till 11 A.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at twenty-five minutes past six of the clock till eleven of the clock on Friday, the 21st November, 1986.